

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are now pending in the application. Claim 7 has been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0026248 hereinafter Goren) in view of Dunn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,209 hereinafter Dunn). Claims 4, 6 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn, and further in view of Tian, and further in view of Livingston (U.S. Pat. No. 6,621,590 hereinafter Livingston). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes independent claim 1 has been amended to include “wherein the user data is text, operating the computer to superimpose a colored mosaic comprises operating the computer to superimpose an array of diamonds of alternating colors on the text.” Additionally, independent claim 16 has been amended to include the instruction of “create the obscuring colored watermark from a geometric pattern including a geometric shape having at least four sides.” Independent claim 20 has been amended to include the limitation of “the obscuring colored mosaic is comprised of a geometric shape having at least four sides.” Support for these amendments can be found in the specification and drawings as filed and, thus, are not new matter.

Applicant respectfully asserts, as also noted by the Examiner, that neither Goren nor Dunn, either alone or in combination with Tian or Livingston, teach or suggest these features as claimed. Specifically, the Examiner noted that “neither Goren et al. nor

Dunn et al. explicitly discloses the limitation of the colored mosaic comprising an array of diamonds of alternating colors.” Applicant also respectfully asserts neither Goren nor Dunn teaches or suggests the use of geometric shapes as claimed in independent claim 16. Further, Applicant submits these features as claimed in independent claims 1 and 16 are neither taught nor suggested by Tian nor Livingston. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts independent claims 1 and 16 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Since claims 4, 6 and 17-19 each depend from either independent claim 1 or 16, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn, and further in view of Tian (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0146123 hereinafter Tian). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn, and further in view of Tian, and further in view of Livingston, and further in view of Parikh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,801,697). Claims 7-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn, and further in view of Long. Claims 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goren in view of Dunn, and further in view of Bernheiser (U.S. Pat. No. 5,587,747). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes claims 2, 3, 5 and 8-15 all depend from either independent claims 1 or 16. As stated previously, Applicant believes claims 1 and 16 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant believes claims 2, 3, 5 and 8-15 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 15, 2004

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps